

REMARKS:

The Office Action dated January 10, 2008 has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claim 1 has been amended as to form only. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are pending in the application and submitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arikita (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,226). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claims 1-3 recite subject matter that is not disclosed by Arikita.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-3 depend, defines a brush mounting structure of a cutting table in an automatic cutting machine that includes at least one cut-support surface brush mounted onto a brush mount. The cut-support surface brush has a plurality of rows of projections at a back side of the same. The projections of the brush are detachably engageable with and movable with respect to the brush mount, The projections include an engaging projection having an engaging surface which is more secure in hooking degree than an engaging surface of a back-row projection and serves as a holding surface is formed in a front low of the brush, to prevent undesired release of the engagement between the brush and the brush mount against a load applied from a particular direction orthogonal to a direction in which the brush is movable over the brush mount. The mount includes a engaging rib having an engaging surface confronting the engaging surface of the projection of the brush, and a holding rib having a holding surface which confronts the engaging surface of the engaging projection of

the brush and is more secure in hooking degree than the engaging surface of the engaging rib are formed in the brush mount.

As a result of the claimed configuration, a novel arrangement is provided wherein the mounting arrangement at the front and rear of the brush differs such that the front of the brush is more firmly engaged than the rear of the brush.

Arikita also discloses a brush mounting structure in an automatic cutting machine. However, in contrast to the claimed invention, the projections (18, 18a) of the brush (5), and the ribs/grooves (13, 13a) of the mount (4) with which the projections engage, are identical at the front and the back of the brush. For example, see Figs. 2, 5, 8 and 9 of Arikita. Thus, Arikita fails to disclose the projection of the brush and the ribs of the mount as defined by claim 1, and Arikita fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, upon which claims 2-3 depend. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 1-3 be allowed.

In view of the above, all objections and rejections have been sufficiently addressed. The Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and requests that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Brian A. Tollefson/
Brian A. Tollefson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,338
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK
1425 K. Street, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 783-6040